



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,154	04/07/2004	Pakiza Mohammad	34866	8966
23589	7590	08/20/2008		
HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP			EXAMINER	
10801 Mastin Blvd., Suite 1000			PARVINI, PEGAH	
Overland Park, KS 66210			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/821,154

Applicant(s)

MOHAMMAD, PAKIZA

Examiner

PEGAH PARVINI

Art Unit

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-149 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-149 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' reply on May 14, 2008 to the previous Election/Restriction request was received; however, upon further consideration, more groups within the claims were found as detailed below.

Also, although Applicants elected previous Group I with traverse, the status identifier for the remaining claims were not accordingly changed to "withdrawn".

Applicants arguments are moot in view of the new restriction requirement defined below and if the same arguments are presented in response to this requirement, they will be addressed at that time.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-12, drawn to an inorganic binder having calcium silicate sites, classified in class 106, subclass 470.
- II. Claims 13-27, drawn to a composition comprising at least an inorganic binder having calcium silicate sites and a filler, classified in class 106, subclass 401.
- III. Claims 28-61 and 149, drawn to a composition comprising an inorganic binder and silicon containing fibers, classified in class 523, subclass 204.

- IV. Claims 62-105, drawn to a product comprising a hydrated layer comprising an inorganic binder, classified in class 264, subclass 46.4.
- V. Claims 106-110, drawn to a kit for preparing an inorganic binder comprising a container containing a water insoluble calcium silicate and at least one container containing at least one compound suitable for preparing an acid alumina-silica phosphate solution, classified in class 106, subclass 316.
- VI. Claims 111-115, drawn to a kit for preparation of an inorganic binder having calcium silicate sites comprising a container containing a water insoluble calcium silicate and at least one container containing at least an acid alumina-silica phosphate solution, classified in class 106, subclass 316.
- VII. Claims 116-141, drawn to a process for preparation of an inorganic binder, classified in class 523, subclass 1.
- VIII. Claims 142-148, drawn to a process for the manufacture of a product comprising a support provided with at least a hardened layer comprising a inorganic binder, classified in class 264, subclass 333.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the

intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a material alone to form a calcium silicate product (i.e. no filler used) and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions I and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a material alone to form a calcium silicate product (i.e. no fibers used) and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions I and IV are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a material to form flower pots (no layer involved) and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions I and V are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the

apparatus can be used for making a materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product such as any compound in an aqueous form. In addition, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (kit) such as one involving multiple containers used to make the calcium silicate material (i.e. (1) a container of a calcium source, (2) a container of a silica source, and (3) a reaction container).

Inventions I and VI are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product such as any compound in an aqueous form. In addition, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (kit) such as one involving multiple containers used to make the calcium silicate material (i.e. (1) a container of a calcium source, (2) a container of a silica source, and (3) a reaction container) and/or one having a container containing water, at least a container containing aluminum oxide, another container containing silica, and finally a container containing phosphoric acid.

Inventions I and VII are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as mixing aluminum phosphate or aluminum hydroxide with silica and acid to which calcium silicate particles are added and after this step, the mixture temperature is changed accordingly to maintain it at above 50°C.

Inventions I and VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product such as a product other than a layered product (i.e. uniform structure).

Inventions II and III are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have different design and thus, do not overlap in scope because

in one group, a composition comprising an inorganic binder contains a filler and in the other a composition containing an inorganic binder contains silicon containing fibers. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants. In view of these differences between the two groups, the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together, can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, and/or effect.

Inventions II and IV are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope as one is directed to a composition comprising an inorganic binder along with a filler, and the other is directed to a product comprising a hydrated layer which comprises an inorganic binder. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants. In view of these differences between the two groups, the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together, can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, and/or effect.

Inventions II and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs,

modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are apparent because invention II is a composition that involves the use of a filler and invention V is a kit for preparing an inorganic binder containing at least one container containing at least one compound suitable for preparing an acid alumina-silica phosphate and a composition, wherein the kit is devoid of a filler (none mentioned). In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions II and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are apparent because invention II is a composition that involves the use of a filler and invention VI is a kit for preparing an inorganic binder containing at least one container containing at least an acid alumina-silica phosphate solution and a composition, wherein the kit is devoid of a filler (none mentioned). In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions II and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are invention II which is based on a binder and a filler and invention VII which is a process for preparation of the inorganic binder only (devoid of a filler). In

view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions II and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are invention II is based on a binder and a filler and invention VIII is a process for preparation of a product based on a hardened layer. In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions III and IV are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope as one is directed to a composition comprising an inorganic binder and silicon containing fiber and the other is directed to a product comprising a hydrated layer comprising an inorganic binder. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants. In view of these differences between the two groups, the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use

together, can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, and/or effect.

Inventions III and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are apparent because invention III is a composition that involves the use of fibers (characteristics defined) and invention V is a kit for preparing an inorganic binder containing at least one container containing at least one compound suitable for preparing an acid alumina-silica phosphate and a composition, wherein the kit is devoid of a filler (none mentioned). In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions III and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are apparent because invention III is a composition that involves the use of fibers (specific characteristics) and invention VI is a kit for preparing an inorganic binder containing at least one container containing at least an acid alumina-silica phosphate solution and a composition, wherein the kit is devoid of a filler (none mentioned). In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions III and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are invention III which is based on a binder and fibers (characteristics defined) and invention VII is a process for preparation the inorganic binder only (devoid of a filler). In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions III and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are invention III which is based on a binder and fibers (characteristics defined) and invention VIII is a process preparation of the product based on a hardened layer. In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are apparent because invention IV is a product having a hardened layer comprising the binder and invention V is a kit for preparing an inorganic binder

containing at least one container containing at least one compound suitable for preparing an acid alumina-silica phosphate and a composition, wherein the kit is devoid of the product recited. In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions IV and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are apparent because invention IV is a product having a hardened layer comprising the binder and invention VI is a kit for preparing an inorganic binder containing at least one container containing at least an acid alumina-silica phosphate solution and a composition, wherein the kit is devoid of the product recited. In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions IV and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are invention IV is based on a product comprising a hardened layer of the binder and invention VII is a process for preparation the inorganic binder only (devoid of the product). In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions IV and VIII are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as forming a hardened layer and bonding the layer to a support by way of a inorganic binder, other than calcium silicate.

Inventions V and VI are directed to related products (i.e. kits). The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope as one is directed to a kit for preparing an inorganic binder containing at least one container containing at least one compound suitable for preparing an acid alumina-silica phosphate, and the other is a kit for preparing an inorganic binder containing at least one container containing at least an acid alumina-silica phosphate solution. It is apparent that kit I involves the use of precursors and kit II does not. In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions V and VII are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus such as one involving multiple containers used to make the calcium silicate material, i.e. (1) a container of a calcium source, (2) a container of a silica source, and (3) a reaction container).

Inventions V and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are invention V which is a kit for preparing inorganic binders only and invention VIII which is a process for the preparation a product comprising hardened layers. In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions VI and VII are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the process as claimed can be practiced by another and

materially different apparatus such as one involving multiple containers used to make the calcium silicate material, i.e. (1) a container of a calcium source, (2) a container of a silica source, and (3) a reaction container) and/or one having a container containing water, at least a container containing aluminum oxide, another container containing silica, and finally a container containing phosphoric acid.

Inventions VI and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are invention VI which is a kit for preparing inorganic binders only and invention VIII which is a process for the preparation a product comprising hardened layers. In view of this, the inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects in view of the distinctions defined above.

Inventions VII and VIII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have different design and thus, do not overlap in scope because in one group, the process is for making the binder only and the other process is for making a hardened layered product. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not

encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants. In view of these differences between the two groups, the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together, can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, and/or effect.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement

may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise

require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PEGAH PARVINI whose telephone number is (571)272-2639. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/Michael A Marcheschi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793